

CONFIDENTIAL

16 th February, 1960.

COCOM Document No. 3879

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

THE REPORT OF THE DRAFTING GROUP ON THE INTERNATIONAL LISTS

11th February 1960

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan,
Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM 1766, 3700.10, 3851, 3854, 3864.

1. The CHAIRMAN referred to the two reports (1959 List Review/W.P. 11 and 12) of the Drafting Group which had been set up to examine the need for clarification and standardization of the definitions in the International Lists. He recalled that the first report, dealing with the standardization of reporting procedures for administrative exceptions, had already been discussed in the Committee (COCOM 3851, 3854, 3864). He enquired whether Delegates had any further statements to make concerning the two aspects of this question: the notification of administrative exceptions on a licensing or shipments basis and the proposal to standardize the time limit for reporting such exceptions at 15 days. The second report drew the Committee's attention to the following editorial improvements which might be made to avoid misunderstanding in the interpretation of the lists: [WHEN "IMMEDIATE", "PROMPT" ETC. NOTIFICATION IS CURRENTLY REQUIRED]

- (a) A variety of wordings was used for the sub-items referring to parts, components, accessories, etc. It might be advisable to re-examine these sub-items with a view to standardizing the wording.
- (b) Sub-items were sometimes linked by the word "or". It might be advisable to adopt a uniform procedure.
- (c) The Drafting Group were of opinion that consideration might be given by the Committee, in all cases where percentages were given, to specifying the denomination (weight, volume, etc.) intended.
- (d) It might be advisable to review the use of expressions indicating "specially designed", "capable of", etc. with a view to clarifying their meaning and standardizing their use.
- (e) Another matter to which thought might be given by the Committee was the use of the expression "n.e.s.", with a view to standardizing this usage.
- (f) If this work were undertaken, it might be useful at the same time to standardize expressions such as "more than", "or more", "less than" and "or less".

The above remarks applied especially to the English version of the Lists and only in part to the French version.

The Chairman asked Delegates for their views as to how the Committee should deal with these points. He suggested that the Drafting Group might be asked to give exact indications of where the discrepancies occurred and to make concrete proposals for handling them. It would be useful if this work could be completed by the time of the 1960 List review so that the amendments could be incorporated in the new lists issued after that review.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3879

2. The ITALIAN Delegate said that he had already adopted a clear position with regard to the reporting of administrative exceptions (COCOM 3864, paragraph 6). As far as the second report was concerned, he felt that the best solution was for the Drafting Group to continue with their work, identify the items in question and make suggestions for dealing with them.
3. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate, referring to the time limit for reporting administrative exceptions, said that his authorities felt that it would be useful if the Committee could agree to standardize on 15 days. They would themselves have preferred a slightly longer period but they were willing to accept 15 days.
4. The GERMAN Delegate stated that his authorities could accept a standard time limit of 15 days.
5. The FRENCH Delegate said that his authorities had given careful study to the standardization of the reporting procedures for administrative exceptions. They had given him no fresh instructions. In reply to a question put by the Italian Delegate as to whether his authorities had alternative proposals to submit to the Committee, he said that the present system had given satisfactory results and his authorities saw no need to make any changes.
6. The GERMAN Delegate stated that his authorities would continue to report on a licensing basis despite the fact that there was no unanimity for this system. They hoped that other Member Countries would do the same.
7. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate informed the Committee that his authorities would continue to report on a licensing basis.
8. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that there was no need to restate the views which were recorded in paragraphs 2 and 8 of COCOM 3864. He expressed his disappointment that the French Delegation had been unable to permit the Committee to reach agreement. His authorities hoped that the lack of unanimity would not continue for long.
9. The CHAIRMAN stated that there was no point in continuing the discussion on the standardization of the reporting procedures for administrative exceptions if no new elements were introduced. The large majority of the Committee would continue to report on a licensing basis. If the other Member Country concerned decided eventually to follow suit, it would notify the Committee of its intention. The same remarks applied to the 15 day time limit. He invited Delegates to give their views on the second report of the Drafting Group.
10. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate suggested that the bulk of the work might more conveniently be done in capitals, then Delegations could raise points individually before the 1960 List Review. He thought that agreement on percentages (paragraph 1(c) above) might be reached immediately.
11. The GERMAN Delegate agreed that the actual work of standardization should be completed by the next List Review. He suggested that decisions of principle might be made at the present stage as far as one or two points were concerned. The question of percentages mentioned by the United Kingdom Delegate was one example: it could be agreed that percentages always referred to weight unless specifically stated otherwise. An administrative principle could be worked out to cover the variety of terms mentioned in paragraph 1(a), saying, for example, that "parts" meant "components", "accessories" and the other words used. The terms mentioned in paragraph 1(d) above should be limited to three standard terms: "specially designed", "capable of" and "rated for" and a clear definition should be agreed for each of these.
12. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that his authorities had carefully

C O N F I D E N T I A L

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

COCOM Document No. 3879

studied the second report of the Drafting Group and had come to the conclusion that the total programme might not justify the volume of work involved. He agreed with the United Kingdom suggestion that individual practical problems might be submitted to the Committee as the need was seen by any Member Country. Concerning the specific problem of percentages, he agreed that weight was what was intended, except in Items 1770 where the percentage should be in volume terms and 1781, where the present wording was adequate.

13. The CHAIRMAN of the Drafting Group, in reply to a question by the United Kingdom Delegate, stated that the percentage given in Item 1631(c) referred neither to weight nor to volume but to remanence.

14. After further discussion, the COMMITTEE agreed that the Secretariat should compile a list of the particular points made by the Drafting Group, together with the items where they occurred, within the next few weeks. This list would then form the basis of further discussions in the Committee. The Committee also agreed in principle that percentages given in the International Lists referred always to weight unless specifically stated otherwise.

C O N F I D E N T I A L